



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/820,269

04/08/2004

Torsten Schulz

15111.0081

8565

27890 7590 02/12/2009
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

LUNDGREN, JEFFREY S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1639

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/12/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/820,269</p>	<p>Applicant(s) SCHULZ ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner JEFFREY S. LUNDGREN</p>	<p>Art Unit 1639</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-24, 44 and 45.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 25-43.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/ Christopher S. F. Low /
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1636

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants traverse the rejection with a number of comments that do not consider the art as a whole, and misplace the context of the references that are relied upon in the outstanding rejections. Applicants allege on page 9 of their Reply filed on January 27, 2009, that: "(a) none of references teach all of the claimed limitations; (b) that the references do not stand for the teachings assigned to them; and (c) there is no reason or motivation to combine the references so as to arrive at the claimed." These statements are simply incorrect.

Regarding Applicants' contentions that "none of the references teach all of the claimed limitations," it should be well understood by Applicants that a rejection based upon 35 USC § 103(a) relies on multiple teachings for demonstrating that all of the claim limitations were known and obvious between the combination of references. There is no requirement that one reference teach all of the limitations as stated by Applicants. Such considerations are reserved for 35 USC § 102.

Applicants' assertions the Blackburn disclosure does not teach a recess is incorrect (see page 9 of Applicants' Reply, second paragraph in the "Blackburn" section). When one considers the function role of a gasket it is infact to provide a "recess" and the volume in the "recess" can provide an open volume or can be filled (e.g., similar to an o-ring). Therefore, the gaskets disclosed throughout Blackburn meet the claim limitation of "a sealing intermediate having an enclosed recess". This concept is also applicable to Applicants other arguments regarding the references not teaching "a recess".

Regarding Applicants arguments directed to the lack of teaching by Ehricht, such comments are incorrect, as it is the combination of Ehricht and other three references that teaches all of the limitations. For example, Ehricht teaches a chamber body, a chamber support and a sealing connection, and these elements are held together in a fixable manner such as by an adhesive or weld. The other teachings, such as Paul, clearly show how one may also rely on "holding elements" such as those shown in Figure 3 of Paul. The rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) is therefore maintained.